



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,587	11/06/2001	Kent Ryhorchuk	014940-002410US	9311

2292 7590 08/28/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

PAYNE, DAVID C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2633

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/045,587

Applicant(s)

RYHORCHUK ET AL.

Examiner

David C. Payne

Art Unit

2633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 June 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2633

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because the drawings are poor quality photocopy and in some cases hand drawn. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1-3, 5, 8-12, 14, 17-19, 21, 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merli et al. US 6,088,141 (Merli) in view of Fee et al. US 5,914,794 (Fee).

Re claims 1, 8-10, 17, 24-26

Merli disclosed,

A system for detecting faults in an optical network, comprising: a first node (figure 1a, 102) and a second node (figure 1a, 104); and an amplifier (figure 1a, 262 or 264) coupled between the first node and the second node, the node configured to detect a fault on an optical link connecting the node and the first node and generate a fault report upon detection of the fault (e.g., col/line: 6/5-20). Merli further disclosed detecting loss of power or loss of signal (e.g., col/line: 4/35-50, 6/5-10).

Merli does not distinguish separate amplifier nodes for detecting the fault but rather incorporates amplification into each node that detects the fault. It would have been obvious to one ordinary

Art Unit: 2633

skill in the art at the time of invention that placing the amplification and detection in separate nodes no different that combining the amplification with the local nodes. Making parts separable is not patentable over the prior art.

Furthermore, the fault monitor (figure 2 #222) communicates with the network management system (116) but does not to forward the fault report to the second node. Fee disclosed an optical ring with fault management that communicates with an element manager (figure 1 – 43) while the fault information is propagated along the supervisory channels (figure 1 – 21a-n, e.g., col/line: 5/60-67, 6/1-6, 2/20-25). Furthermore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that add the Fee fault forward capability to the Merli invention for the benefit of a robust and highly fault tolerant orthogonal (“bridge and ladder”) detection and reporting system as discussed in Merli (e.g., col/line: 4/42-56).

Re claim 2, 11, 18

The system of Merli and Fee as discussed above is capable of forwarding error reports around failed nodes to nodes that are able to initiate a switching action to restore traffic thereby increasing fault tolerance (see Fee, e.g., col/line: 4/42-56).

Re claims 3, 12, 19, 27

The system of Merli and Fee as discussed above disclosed wherein the fault report is forwarded until the fault report is received by a node which is capable of switching traffic. (see Fee, e.g., col/line: 5/61-67, 6/1-16).

Re claims 5, 14, 21

The system of Merli and Fee as discussed above disclosed wherein the amplifier (local node) is further configured to receive and pass a fault report from another amplifier node to the second node.(e.g., Fee, col/line: 5/60-67, 6/1-6, 2/20-25)

Art Unit: 2633

4. Claims 4, 6, 13, 15, 20, 22, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merli et al. US 6,088,141 (Merli) and Fee et al. US 5,914,794 (Fee) as applied to claims 1, 10, 17 and 26 above, and further in view of Tada et al. US 5,532,862 (Tada).

Re claims 4, 6, 13, 15, 20, 22, 28

Merli and Fee do not disclose prioritizing faults. Tada disclosed a fault prioritization generation and forwarding method (). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the Tada fault priority method with the Merli and Fee system for the benefit efficiency and reduction of time required to restore traffic in a network as discussed by Tada (e.g., col/line: 2/55-65).

5. Claims 7, 16, 23 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merli et al. US 6,088,141 (Merli) and Fee et al. US 5,914,794 (Fee) as applied to claims 1, 10, 17 and 26 above, and further in view of Cohen et al. US 4,736,359 (Cohen).

Re claims 7, 16, 23 and 29

Merli and Fee do not disclose wherein the optical network is a bi-directional line switched ring network. Cohen disclosed a bi-directional line switched ring network with fault prioritization (e.g., col/line: 1/35-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the Cohen bi-directional line switched ring network with the Merli and Fee system for the benefit of size and weight savings as discussed by Cohen (see. Col/line: 1/35-40).

Art Unit: 2633

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David C. Payne whose telephone number is (703) 306-0004. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7a-4p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (703) 305-4729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Dcp

Application/Control Number: 10/045,587

Page 6

Art Unit: 2633



JASON CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600